

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/658,824	09/08/2003	Stephen I. Rennard	UNMC/03017/0008 7805		
7590 09/13/2006			EXAMINER		
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP			AFREMOVA, VERA		
Suite 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
3040 Post Oak E	31va.		ARTONII	TAFER NUMBER	
Houston, TX 77056-6582			1651		
			DATE MAILED: 09/13/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action							
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brid	ef						

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/658,824	RENNARD ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Vera Afremova	1651	

Advisory Action	10/030,024	KENNAKO ET AL.	· ·			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Vera Afremova	1651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo They are not deemed to place the application in be 	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	•		(DTAL 00.0)			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-19</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	4 . *	•				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by see attached.	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>2/21/06</u>	and 1/05/04				

Application/Control Number: 10/658,824

Art Unit: 1651

Attachment to Advisory Action

Applicants arguments filed 7/21/2006 have been fully considered but not found persuasive because they are mostly directed to the same issues discussed in the last office action.

Therefore, claims 11-19 remain rejected as explained in the prior office action.

Main applicants' argument is directed to the teaching by the cited patent US 2003/0119107 (Dang et al). Applicants appear to argue (page 5, par. 2-3) that Dang et al. teach away by stating that a matrix "does not interfere with the growth and differentiation of EBs" and, thus, the matrix does not "influence differentiation or growth of EBs in any manner" (paragraph 168). Upon review this is not found persuasive because differentiation is influenced by a culture medium supplemented with cytokines and/or growth factor but not by the matrix providing for support or for "scaffold" within the meaning of the claimed invention. Thus, the matrix does not "influence differentiation" in the cited method within the meaning the claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

The missing copies of the references 3 and 4 (IDS filed 1/05/2004) were not provided. Therefore, the information disclosure statement filed 1/05/2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Thus, the references 3 and 4 were not considered in the absence of the copies of that portion which caused it to be listed on IDS filed 1/05/2004.

Art Unit: 1651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vera Afremova whose telephone number is (571) 272-0914. The examiner can normally be reached from Monday to Friday from 9.30 am to 6.00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached at (571) 272-0926.

The fax phone number for the TC 1600 where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 1600, telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Vera Afremova

AU 1651

September 8, 2006

VERA AFREMOVA

V. Ifn

PRIMARY EXAMINER